

to this bill often. I hoped the administration would support the language. So I was quietly running the language to the administration and certainly getting the support of the administration—if not openly, at least they were not opposed to it. We were working with them tacitly.

The very next day the tune changed, and the newspapers announced the administration was against the Byrd amendment. So they flip-flopped over night; they made a 180-degree turn over night. One day I had the confidence of them. They were looking at the language, making any responses they wished to make to express their viewpoint. The next day they were 100 percent on the other side.

So I say this amendment is a test. I say to the working men and women of America, do not believe the pretty words you may hear. Pretty words are easy. And I have heard pretty words myself. Watch what happens with this amendment, I say to the working men and women of America. Watch what happens to this amendment. See if the actions of those who say they are your friend do match those pretty promises.

I thank my distinguished friend and colleague. I am pleased to associate myself with his remarks. Well done, my friend.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank my senior colleague and I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Texas is recognized.

#### SOMETHING IS OUT OF BALANCE IN AMERICA

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, it is easy when you come to work every day in the most historic and important building in the world to forget you are part of history—to forget you are in a sacred place where history has been made in the past. But it is even easier to forget you are making history now.

But I am reminded that we are making history now when I listen to Senator BYRD speak with righteousness on behalf of the working people of West Virginia. And might I also say, I have never heard a more eloquent speech in the Senate than Senator CRAIG's speech that he gave earlier.

Having heard those speeches—including Senator MCCONNELL's and Senator ROCKEFELLER's—I do not want to rise to talk about the substance. I do not think you can improve on what they had to say. But there is an important point, at least in my mind, that I want to make; and that is, something is wrong in America. Something is out of balance in America.

If tomorrow in West Virginia a sub-species of crickets develop that have legs 6 millimeters longer than crickets as we know them, or that have brown or white specks on them, they would be protected before the law. They would be protected by the Endangered Species Act. There would literally be thou-

sands of people who would be willing to troop to West Virginia and hold signs and demand that this new sub-species of crickets be protected.

But yet when the livelihood of people who hear that alarm ring at 4:30 a.m. in the morning—and if you grew up in one of those houses—I know Senator BYRD did—the next sound you would hear is those two feet hitting the floor. It is predictable. You know what is going to happen, whether it is raining or whether it is not raining. These are people who get up every day, who work hard, who struggle to make ends meet, who sit down around the kitchen table on the first day of the month and get out that stub they got with their paycheck. Then they take the back of an envelope, or a piece of paper, and they try to figure out how they are going to be able to pay their bills, and who they can get by without paying this month. They contribute to America by producing things America needs.

I think something is out of kilter in America when our laws are more focused on protecting sub-species of crickets than they are focused on protecting people who earn a living with the sweat of their brow and with their hands.

I think something is very wrong in America when there does not seem to be much focus on working men and women. And what was moving to me about Senator BYRD's speech is he was speaking on behalf of the people who work with their hands, and who work for a living, and who often do not have much of a voice in American Government.

I am not here to criticize people who have focused, in some cases, their lives, their civic activity, and their leisure time activity on the environment. But I think something is wrong when, in focusing on the environment, we forget about people who work for a living and are affected.

I think, in some cases, environmentalism has gone too far. I think, in some cases, that it has become anti-growth. Maybe that makes sense if you live in a fancy air-conditioned house and if your children have gone to college. If you have boundless opportunities, it makes sense to say we need to protect the environment at all costs and that there is no burden that is too great to bear. After all, the person saying that already has a piece of the American pie and has already generally lived the American dream.

But I think what Senator BYRD has reminded us of is that not every American has lived the American dream. Not every American has gotten a piece of the pie.

I think when we have focused so much on a sub-species of crickets, it is about time that people in the Senate stand up and say: What about people who make a living in the mining industries of this country—people who have had placed on their livelihood less weight by American law than we place on the assumed well-being of sub-

species of crickets? I think something is out of balance in America. I think we need to bring it back into balance. I think we need to remind people who are so concerned about one particular element of the environment that there is no more basic part of the environment than the ability of the people in West Virginia, or Kentucky, or Texas, or any other State in the Union to make their house payment, or their ability to earn a livelihood, or their ability to have self-respect in their own worth of what they do.

We are not talking about tearing down America's environmental laws. No country in history has a better environment than we have. No country has spent more resources and legitimate effort on their environment than we have.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business extend until 6 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not—there are some of us who would like to speak on this debate concerning this particular issue and who have been waiting for a while. Could we get some sequence of order perhaps?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, Senator LANDRIEU is to follow, and Senator KOHL is to follow Senator LANDRIEU. There is no UC. Senator LANDRIEU was the last covered.

Mr. GRAMM. As far as I am aware, we have gone back and forth from the Democrat side to the Republican side. I have listened to five other people speak. I have been well served by hearing their speeches. I will be as brief as I can.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be in order of sequence on the Democratic side as we move back and forth.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if we could simply accommodate every speaker, while realizing that we are waiting for the omnibus bill to come over from the House, may I suggest we amend that unanimous consent request so that the Senator be recognized in the order of the sequence we have, but that when the omnibus bill comes over from the House, it continue to take precedence?

Mr. KERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. It is my understanding the Senator appropriately asked for an extension until 6. It is my understanding the Senator from Louisiana wants to speak for only 10 minutes, or less. The Senator from Minnesota wants 5 minutes. I think if we could get an order, we could contain it within the time and everybody would be satisfied. I ask the Senator from Alaska how long he wants to speak.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. In responding to my friend from Massachusetts, about 6 minutes. I am satisfied if we go back and forth, as suggested, it would concur with the unanimous consent agreement pending.

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent that following the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Louisiana be recognized for 10 minutes; following that, the Senator from Alaska be recognized for 5 minutes; the Senator from Minnesota for 5 minutes; and I would like to follow the Senator from Minnesota for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. To clarify that, when the District of Columbia appropriations conference report and its parts arrive, that will be taken up at that point regardless of the order. But then, of course, when that is completed, we can go back to this order.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, again, may I ask the distinguished majority leader: I think we have such a tight containment here, there are some who have some problems off the floor. So it may be that he would be held up by about 5 minutes, I think, in total.

Mr. LOTT. If it is something like that, it should not be a problem. But they are voting in the House at this time, so the papers will be headed this way. Rather than holding up the debate getting started, I think with the order we have lined up, we should be all right. I think we could extend the colloquy to the point where we couldn't do the business of the Senate.

Mr. KERRY. Would the majority leader then permit us to put in place the request we have made?

Mr. LOTT. I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, it is obvious that there are a lot of people who want to speak. Let me sum up by saying that in an era where I think we have gotten Government out of balance, where extremist elements are determined to impose their will and their values—often at the expense of the jobs of people who work with their hands and who, in the process, contribute to America—when we become callous to the needs of working people by catering to people who are often quite well off and quite successful and quite comfortable, who, in some cases, would put their interests and their hobbies ahead of working people, it is very important that we have someone such as Senator BYRD who pulls us back to reality.

I think Senator BYRD mentioned my name as a cosponsor. But just in case he did not, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMM. I am proud to support this amendment. I think the adminis-

tration has become dominated by people who are more concerned about specific elements of the environment, as they define it, than they are concerned about the environment based on good science. I think they are more concerned about their values than the well-being of the people who do the work and pay the taxes and pull the wagon in America.

It is easy for a planner or an idealist to set out a policy and act as if destroying the livelihood of a coal miner is as irrelevant as simply overturning a regulation. But we know the difference between a regulation and the livelihood of a coal miner. It is because we know the difference that we are here.

I hope this amendment passes. I hope it sends a clear signal that the Clinton administration has become an extremist administration in terms of the environment. This is a bipartisan effort. I think it is important. I think it pulls us back to the center in recognizing we want a better environment. But we want to look at costs and benefits. We want to look at science. When we are putting thousands of people out of work, we ought to stop and reflect on what we are doing. Senator BYRD is asking us to do that today. I am proud to join him in this effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

#### NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am appreciative of the 10 minutes granted to speak on a different subject. I understand that mining is an important issue and deserves our attention. Until it is resolved, we will probably be working for many days. I know that the Senior Senator from West Virginia feels very passionately about this issue, and other Members may want to add their remarks as the evening goes on, so I will try to be brief.

A week from tomorrow, many of us will head home to be with our families and celebrate Thanksgiving. In my mind, it is extremely appropriate that Thanksgiving falls in this month, which many of you know is National Adoption Month. For like Thanksgiving, National Adoption Month is a time not only for celebration but also for reflection.

So let me begin with some facts about adoption that people may find interesting in hopes that this would be something the American people will embrace. In 1992, the last year for which adoption statistics were available, there were 127,000 children adopted in the United States. Forty-two percent of these children were adopted by step parents or relatives; 15 percent of these adoptions were from foster care; 5 percent adopted children from other countries; and 37 percent of these children were adopted by private agencies.

The poster behind me is a collage of just a few of the 130,000 legally freed children awaiting permanent families.

Some of them are only children and some are sibling groups, some are younger children some are older. Although they are all different, all of these beautiful children are looking for someone to love and care for them and to make them a part of their home.

The fact remains that there are half a million children in foster care. By way of comparison, allow me to refer to a hometown landmark, the Superdome. The Superdome has hosted several superbowl—the Saints have never been to one there, but other teams have. We can seat about 80,000 people in the Superdome. To get an accurate vision of the number of children, picture 5 superdomes filled with children, one in every seat. That is a lot of children—if you think about one in each seat in five Superdomes—in need of homes in America.

The average age of children in foster care is 9.5 years. The problem is many children spend the average of 3 years in foster care. Three years is too long to live without the love and security of a permanent family. We need to shorten that time. If a child has to be removed from their biological parents because of terrible, unfortunate circumstances, they should spend a short time in foster care and then be placed permanently with a loving family. Seventy percent of the children available for adoption and foster care are under the age of 10. They should not spend their tender years without a home.

True, we are making progress and we should be proud. In 1996, 28,000 children in foster care were placed in permanent homes. It is projected that, in 1999, the number will be 36,000, an increase of about 30 percent.

In celebration of those who made this progress possible, the Congressional Coalition on Adoption instituted a wonderful idea that we hope will go on year after year, The Congressional Angels In Adoption. We asked all of our colleagues to send in recommendations for individuals in their respective States and districts who had done something extraordinary in the area of adoption. I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of the 55 families who have been nominated and selected for the first 1999 Angels In Adoption Awards.

I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### 1999 ANGELS IN ADOPTION

Freddie Mac Foundation, Virginia, Nancy Kleingartner, Bismarck, North Dakota, Jeff and Earletta Morris, Marshalltown, Iowa, Earl and Judy Priest, Caldwell, Idaho, Dave Thomas, Dublin, Ohio, Peter and Mary Myers, Sikeston, Missouri, James and Denise Jones, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Fletcher Thompson & Jim Thompson, Spartanburg, South Carolina, Carol McMahon, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Lori and Willie Johnson, Russellville, Arkansas, Candice Mueller, Ewing, New Jersey, Joan McLaughlin, Morristown, New Jersey, Carol Stoudt, Fargo, North Dakota, Bill and Laura Trickey, Kansas City,